



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

[Signature]
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,579	10/12/2005	Marco Maria Gentile	3765-0114PUS1	1844
2292 7590 04/06/2007 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			EXAMINER PUTTLITZ, KARL J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1621	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/06/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 04/06/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/531,579	Applicant(s) GENTILE ET AL.	
	Examiner Karl J. Puttlitz	Art Unit 1621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

KARL PUTTLITZ
PATENT EXAMINER

3/26/07

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/27/2006 has been entered.

The outstanding rejection under section 122, second paragraph is withdrawn in view of the amendments deleting the term "supporting substances".

The following is a new ground of rejection under section 112, second paragraph:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a pharmaceutical composition, wherein the composition is formulated for parenteral administration. However, it is unclear what additional ingredients are required, or what other differences there are between a

Art Unit: 1621

composition is formulated for parenteral administration, and that which is already recited in the claim, i.e., that with the required pH and being free from preservatives and co-solvents.

The rejection under section 102 is maintained and repeated below. Applicant's remarks in connection with this ground of rejection are also addressed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,342,530 to Darko (Darko).

Claim1 recites a pharmaceutical composition suitable for parenteral administration having anti-inflammatory and analgesic property, characterized in that it contains an alkylammonium salt of a 2-arylpropionic acid selected from ketoprofen, ibuprofen, naproxen or tiaprofenic acid, in racemic or in enantiomeric form, in an aqueous solution at a pH in the range between 8 and 9, said solution being free of preservatives, co-solvents and supporting substances.

With regard to the above embodiments, Darko teaches, in Example 4, a formulation of ibuprofen lysinate substantially free of any excipient, organic solvent,

Art Unit: 1621

buffer, acid, base, or salt. The example makes reference to the subsequent tables, in which samples having a pH of 6.5-8.5 are recorded, see Table 1.

The forgoing anticipates claim 1 within the meaning of section 102.

Applicant argues that consideration of the reference as a whole shows that Table 1 merely provides data recorded as the solution for injection was being prepared. This portion of the text makes clear that the solution is mixed, the pH is measured and the pH is adjusted. One skilled in the art would not be motivated to maintain a pH of from 8 to 9 in view of the disclosure of Darko.

Furthermore, Applicants submitted that Table 1 in Darko merely discloses the pH of "pooled samples" and not the final parenteral compositions that, at some unknown point in time, had a pH of 6.5 to 8.5. These samples do not necessarily correspond to actual parenteral compositions administered to patients.

However, the Darko disclosure makes it clear that an aqueous solutions of pH 6.5-8.5 existed, which anticipates the compositions in claim 1. In this regard, 35 USC 102 only requires that every element of the claim is taught by the reference. Here, Darko teaches solutions at pH 6.5-8.5, which contain all the elements of those solutions of claim 1, and it does not matter that this solution was further altered to a different pH, since section 102 does not require that the disclosed composition be in it's final form, see MPEP 2131.

With regard to the argument that the samples do not necessarily correspond to actual parenteral compositions administered to patients, there is no evidence that the

Art Unit: 1621

disclosed solutions at pH 6.5-8.5 cannot be administered for parenteral administration. Indeed, the reference teaches the elements of the claimed composition, and any intended use, or other characteristic would be also necessarily possessed by the disclosed compositions, see MPEP 2112 ("[T]he discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition, or of a scientific explanation for the prior art's functioning, does not render the old composition patentably new to the discoverer." *Atlas Powder Co. v. Ireco Inc.*, 190 F.3d 1342, 1347, 51 USPQ2d 1943, 1947 (Fed. Cir. 1999).").

The following is a new ground of rejection:

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Anacardio et al., Physicochemical compatibility between ketoprofen lysine salt injections (Artrosilene®) and pharmaceutical products frequently used for combined therapy by intravenous administration, Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis Volume 32, Issue 6, 21 August 2003, Pages 1235-1241 (Anacardio).

Anacardio teaches compositions of Artrosilene (ketoprofen lysine salt) and Unasyn with pH's between 8 and 9, see Fig. 1 and Table 3 at page 1239.

Applicant cannot rely upon the foreign priority papers to overcome this rejection because a translation of said papers has not been made of record in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55. See MPEP § 201.15.

The outstanding rejection under section 103 is withdrawn since those of ordinary skill would not have been motivated to combine Darko with Gentile in order to provide compositions with the claimed pH since Gentile teaches compositions with a pH range of 7.0-7.5.

The following is a new ground of rejection under section 112, first paragraph:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

"The standard for determining whether the specification meets the enablement requirement [in accordance with the statute] was cast in the Supreme Court decision of *Mineral Separation v. Hyde*, 242 U.S. 261, 270 (1916) which postured the question: is

Art Unit: 1621

the experimentation needed to practice the invention undue or unreasonable? That standard is still the one to be applied. *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Accordingly, even though the statute does not use the term "undue experimentation," it has been interpreted to require that the claimed invention be enabled so that any person skilled in the art can make and use the invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988). See also *United States v. Telectronics, Inc.*, 857 F.2d 778, 785, 8 USPQ2d 1217, 1223 (Fed. Cir. 1988) ("The test of enablement is whether one reasonably skilled in the art could make or use the invention from the disclosures in the patent coupled with information known in the art without undue experimentation."). A patent need not teach, and preferably omits, what is well known in the art. *In re Buchner*, 929 F.2d 660, 661, 18 USPQ2d 1331, 1332 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 1384, 231 USPQ 81, 94 (Fed. Cir. 1986), *cert. denied*, 480 U.S. 947 (1987); and *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 1463, 221 USPQ 481, 489 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Determining enablement is a question of law based on underlying factual findings. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 495, 20 USPQ2d 1438, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *Atlas Powder Co. v. E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 750 F.2d 1569, 1576, 224 USPQ 409, 413 (Fed. Cir. 1984)." See M.P.E.P. § 2164.

In the instant case the claims covers compositions of alkylammonium salts of 2-arylpropionic acids with a pH in the range of 8 to 9, see claim 1. The claims also cover those compositions further comprising L-lysine ketoprofen in combination with sodium bicarbonate and sodium hydroxide at a pH of 8.5, see claims 2 and 3. Based on the

Art Unit: 1621

above standards, the disclosure must contain sufficient information to enable one skilled in the pertinent art to use this invention without undue experimentation. See M.P.E.P. 2164.01.

However, the state of the art indicates that such compositions are generally a pH of 7.0-7.5, see Gentile (of record) at column 2, lines 9+, 55+, Example 1, and see also Applicant's remarks in connection with this reference in the outstanding response).

The specification and the examples do not provide sufficient disclosure that would provide one of ordinary skill guidance to make compositions with a pH of 8 to 9, given that the compositions described in the specification, those that are instantly claimed, and those that are described in Gentile are substantially the same. Therefore the specification fails to teach how one would provide compositions of the full scope of the claims, i.e., those with a pH of 8-9.

The examiner understands that there is no requirement that the specification disclose every possible embodiment if there is sufficient guidance given by knowledge in the art (See M.P.E.P. § 2164.05(a) "[t]he specification need not disclose what is well-known to those skilled in the art and preferably omits that which is well-known to those skilled and already available to the public. *In re Buchner*, 929 F.2d 660, 661, 18 USPQ2d 1331, 1332 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 1384, 231 USPQ 81, 94 (Fed. Cir. 1986), *cert. denied*, 480 U.S. 947 (1987); and *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 1463, 221 USPQ 481, 489 (Fed. Cir. 1984).").

Art Unit: 1621

However, the instant case goes beyond what is known in the art, because the specification does not offer any guidance on how one of ordinary skill would go about making the invention for recovery of those compositions with a pH of 8-9, where the art teaches that these compositions are a pH of 7.0-7.5.

Applicant is reminded of the heightened enablement for chemical inventions. Specifically, the amount of guidance or direction needed to enable the invention is inversely related to the amount of knowledge in the state of the art as well as the predictability in the art. *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970). The "amount of guidance or direction" refers to that information in the application, as originally filed, that teaches exactly how to make or use the invention. The more that is known in the prior art about the nature of the invention, how to make, and how to use the invention, and the more predictable the art is, the less information needs to be explicitly stated in the specification. In contrast, if little is known in the prior art about the nature of the invention and the art is unpredictable, the specification would need more detail as to how to make and use the invention in order to be enabling. [I]n the field of chemistry generally, there may be times when the well-known unpredictability of chemical reactions will alone be enough to create a reasonable doubt as to the accuracy of a particular broad statement put forward as enabling support for a claim. This will especially be the case where the statement is, on its face, contrary to generally accepted scientific principles. Most often, additional factors, such as the teachings in pertinent references, will be available to substantiate any doubts that the asserted

Art Unit: 1621

scope of objective enablement is in fact commensurate with the scope of protection sought and to support any demands based thereon for proof. [Footnote omitted.]


Here, the requirement for enablement is not met since the claims go far beyond the enabling disclosure.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karl J. Puttlitz whose telephone number is (571) 272-0645. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K. Page, can be reached at telephone number (571) 272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


KARL PUTTLITZ
PATENT EXAMINER

3/24/07